Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 14 1981
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

No. 80-1576

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1980

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY and STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
Appellants,

—against—

CHRIS SCHMID,
Appellee.

On Appeal From the Supreme Court of New Jersey

BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN NEW JERSEY

MICHAEL F. SPICER *
JAMIESON, MCCARDELL, MOORE,
PESKIN & SPICER
194 Nassau Street
Princeton, N. J. 08540
Attorneys for Amicus Curiae

* Counsel of Record

International Printing Co., 711 So. 50th St., Phila., Pa. 19143 — Tel. (215) 727-8711

INTEREST OF THE AMICUS

The Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in New Jersey submits this brief as *amicus curiae* with the consent of all the parties.

The Association previously submitted a brief herein to support the jurisdictional statement filed by Princeton University. It has 16 members, which, as the name of the Association indicates, are all private, higher educational institutions located in the State of New Jersey, as follows:

Name	*Location*	*Approximate Number of Students*
Bloomfield College	Bloomfield	2,100
Caldwell College	Caldwell	720
Centenary College	Hackettstown	950
College of Saint Elizabeth	Convent Station	850
Drew University	Madison (Morris County)	2,525
Fairleigh Dickenson University	Rutherford & other locations	20,125
Felician College	Lodi	765
Georgian Court College	Lakewood	1,385
Monmouth College	Long Branch	3,825
Princeton University	Princeton	6,165
Rider College	Lawrenceville	5,730
Saint Peter's University	Jersey City	4,090
Seton Hall University	So. Orange & Newark	10,225
Stevens Institute of Technology	Hoboken	2,830
Upsala College	East Orange	1,725
Westminster Choir College	Princeton	440

The ruling below of the New Jersey Supreme Court directly affects every member of the Association.

ARGUMENT

The Association supports the position of Princeton University as stated in its brief.

Its members take this position because they believe that they are each different from the other and that they are all different from the public institutions. They believe this diversity is of itself an integral and crucial part of the educational system of this society. They believe that the decision of the New Jersey Superior Court can only tend to make them less diverse and more like each other. This is because the courts will be the ultimate authority of their policies and purposes when it comes to deciding what may be expressed by whom on their property. To permit this reduction in diversity is in contradiction to the constitutional rights of the educational institutions of New Jersey, as is indicated by the cases and argument set forth in the brief of Princeton University.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL F. SPICER,
JAMIESON, MCCARDELL, MOORE,
PESKIN & SPICER,
Attorneys for Amicus Curiae.